



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SUBSTANTIVE *SI*-CLAUSE

By H. C. NUTTING

The subject of the substantive *si*-clause can be approached most readily through a consideration of the conditional periods in which *si* appears with a correlative. When the apodosis of such periods precedes, the correlative is apt to have restrictive force; e. g.:

Cic. *De off.* iii. 13: *id habet hanc, ut opinor, sententiam; cum virtute congruere semper, cetera autem, quae secundum naturam essent, ita legere, si ea virtuti non repugnarent.*

Cic. *P. Marcell.* 8. 25: *sed tum id audirem, si tibi soli viveres aut si tibi etiam soli natus esses.*

Cic. *Ad Att.* xii. 38. 2: *tu, quoniam necesse nihil est, sic scribes aliquid, si vacabis.*

Cic. *Orat.* 58. 197: *quae (sc. quadranda orationis industria) latebit eo magis, si et verborum et sententiarum ponderibus utemur.¹*

More interesting but less frequently noticed are the conditional periods of this sort in which the correlative of *si* is a phrase in the ablative case; e. g.:

Caecina apud Cic. *Ad fam.* vi. 7. 4: *sed tamen ego filio dixeram, librum tibi . . . ea condicione daret, si reciperes te correcturum.*

Cic. *P. Sest.* 10. 24: *foedus fecerunt cum tribuno pl. palam, ut ab eo provincias acciperent quas ipsi vellent . . . ea lege, si ipsi prius tribuno pl. adfictam . . . rem publicam tradidissent.*

Cic. *De invent.* ii. 32. 99: *postea (sc. oportebit) demonstrare potuisse vitari; hac ratione provideri potuisse, si hoc aut illud fecisset.*

Plaut. *Bacch.* 447, 448: *hocine hic pacto potest*

inhibere imperium magister, si ipsus primus vapulet?

That these ablative phrases are correlatives of *si* is established by three circumstances: (a) the sentences, as they stand, are normal conditional periods; i. e., their two clauses are related as

¹ This use of *eo* with a comparative as a correlative of *si* is not generally noted. Other cases are Cic. *De orat.* ii. 52, 209, *P. Rab. Post.* 17. 46, *Tuse. disp.* ii. 26. 64; so also *hoc* with a comparative, Cic. *In Caecil.* 2. 4. Cf. *eo* (without a comparative), Plaut. *Poen.* 1194.

protasis and apodosis; (b) the ablative phrases express manner, and, with their modifiers, have the force of demonstrative adverbs;¹ (c) the ablative phrases make explicit what otherwise would be implicit in *si*; consequently they are somewhat pleonastic—if omitted, the syntax of the clause to which they belong would not suffer, and the meaning of the sentence would still be clear enough.²

It is, however, cases of this sort that pave the way ultimately for the use of *si* in substantive clauses which serve merely as an expansion and explanation of a noun or pronoun. At first sight, some such examples may seem very like the sentences just discussed, but closer inspection will show that the word or phrase expanded by the *si*-clause lacks the qualifications essential to correlation with *si*; e. g.:

Cic. *P. Rab. Post.* 10. 28: nam . . . *haec una ratio* a rege proposita Postumo est servanda pecuniae, *si* curationem et quasi dispensationem regiam *suscepisset*.

Livy xxi. 10. 4: iuvenem flagrantem cupidine regni *viamque unam* ad id cernentem, *si* . . . succinctus armis . . . *vivat*, . . . ad exercitus misistis.

In these sentences *haec una ratio* and *viam unam* are obviously not correlatives of *si*; for (a) they have not the force of demonstrative adverbs; (b) they do not express something that otherwise would be implicit in *si*—their omission would wreck the sentence, and (c) the clauses of which they form a part do not sustain the relation of apodosis to the following *si*-clause, but are independent statements. To these statements the *si*-clause is appended as a tag explaining and expanding *haec una ratio* and *viam unam*, i. e., it is used as a mere substantive clause.³ The

¹ To cover examples in which *si* has not pure conditional force, (a) and (b) would sometimes need interpretation or expansion; e. g., in the case of Caes. *Bell. Afr.* 86: ante oppidum instructos (sc. elephantes) constituit, id *hoc consilio*, *si* posset Vergilius . . . a pertinacia deduci. The choice of the correlative *hoc consilio* is an interesting evidence of the final force of the subjunctive *si*-clause after verbs of action and effort; cf. *University of Cal. Publications, Classical Philology* I, p. 76.

² As, e. g., Cic. *De off.* i. 11. 34.

³ The mood in these substantive *si*-clauses seems to call for no special treatment. The great prevalence of the subjunctive is due to the large number of cases in which there is obliquity partial or total, and to the fact that a substantive *si*-clause dependent on a past tense is apt to carry the *futurum in praeterito* idea.

close parallel to the substantive *ut*-clause may be seen by comparing the passage last cited with the following:

Livy xxxvi. 27. 8: *haec una via omnibus ad salutem visa est, ut in fidem se permetterent Romanorum.*¹

So also in the following sentences:

Cic. *Ad Q. fr.* iii. 1. 1: *totum in eo est, . . . tectorium ut concinnum sit.*

Cic. *Ad Att.* ii. 22. 5: *unum illud tibi persuadeas velim, omnia mihi fore explicata, si te video; sed totum est in eo, si ante* (sc. *te video*) *quam ille ineat magistratum.*

The range of expressions that may be expanded by substantive *si*-clauses is quite considerable. Some very clear-cut examples occur when the phrase contains a numeral greater than one; e. g.:

Cic. *De invent.* ii. 43. 126: *quo in loco iudici demonstrandum est, quid iuratus sit, quid sequi debeat; duabus de causis iudicem dubitare oportere—si aut scriptum sit obscure aut neget aliquid adversarius.*

Cic. *De leg.* ii. 20. 49: *nam illi quidem his verbis docebant; tribus modis* *sacris adstringi—aut hereditate, aut si maiorem partem pecuniae capiat, aut (si maior pars pecuniae legata est) si inde quippiam ceperit.*²

Cic. *De off.* i. 20. 67: *id autem ipsum cernitur in duabus—si et solum id, quod honestum sit, bonum iudices et ab omni animi perturbatione liber sis.*³

Other cases follow:

Cic. *De off.* ii. 12. 43: *quamquam praeclare Socrates hanc viam ad gloriam proximam . . . dicebat esse, si quis id ageret, ut qualis haberet, talis esset.*

Cic. *Ad fam.* vii. 10. 4: *sic enim tibi persuadeas velim, unum mihi esse solacium, quare facilius possim pati te esse sine nobis, si tibi esse id emolumento sciām.*

¹ Cic. *P. Sest.* 65. 137 provides a somewhat similar case with an infinitive: *haec est una via . . . et laudis . . . et honoris, a bonis viris . . . laudari et diligiri, etc.*

² In this sentence the co-ordination of the noun *hereditate* with the two *si*-clauses is additional evidence of the substantival character of the latter; however, the reading is not absolutely certain. The very loose structure of Plaut. *Bacch.* 953-55 leaves it somewhat uncertain whether or not the *si*-clause is substantive, but the case is worth quoting at any rate as an example of remarkable variety of expression:

Ilio tria fuisse audivi *fata*, quae illi forent exitio:
Signum ex arce *si perireset*: alterum etiamst *Troili mors*:
Tertium, *quom portae Phrygiae limen superum scinderetur.*

³ Other cases with such numerals are Cic. *De orat.* iii. 43. 170 (tribus ex rebus), *De fin.* ii. 5. 15 (duobus modis), *De off.* ii. 9. 31 (ex tribus his), *Lael.* 17. 64 (haec duo).

Cic. *Tusc. disp.* i. 46. 111: *illa suspicio* intolerabili dolore cruciat, *si opinamur eos*, quibus orbati sumus, esse cum aliquo sensu in iis malis, quibus volgo opinantur.

Cic. *Post red. in sen.* 4. 8; P. Lentulus *hoc lumen consulatus* sui fore putavit, *si me rei publicae reddidisset*.

Cic. *Acad.* ii. 45. 138: *testatur qui summum bonum dicant id esse, si vacemus omni molestia, eos invidiosum nomen voluptatis fugere, sed*¹

The recognition of this substantive use of the *si*-clause throws light here and there upon passages that otherwise cause perplexity and confusion; e. g.:

Tac. *Annal.* i. 11: *at patres, quibus unus metus, si intellegere viderentur, in questus lacrimas vota effundi.*

Tacitus is here describing the farce enacted between Tiberius and the senate—he professing not to desire imperial power, they urging it upon him. Tacitus means to say that the senators hesitated at no act of servility, their one dread (*unus metus*) being the betrayal of their comprehension of the true inwardness of the situation (*si intellegere viderentur*); i. e., the *si*-clause is used substantively as an expansion and explanation of *unus metus*. Furneaux, however, in his note on this passage, wanders off after Draeger, finding an analogy for *metus si* in *miror si* and like expressions, and finally elaborates an interpretation which seems to me to miss the very point that Tacitus is trying to bring out, namely, the servility of the senators.² A case of this sort is not to be confused with one like the following:

Tac. *Annal.* ii. 42: *ille ignarus doli vel, si intellegere crederetur, vim metuens in urbem properat.*

Here the *si*-clause is a normal protasis, the apodosis being bound up in *vim*, i. e., “fearing violence (would befall him), if it were

¹ See also Cic. *In Verr.* II. i. 1. 3 (eo), *P. Planc.* 38. 93 (eo), *Ad fam.* iv. 14. 1 (eo), Tac. *Agr.* 24 (id); Cic. *De invent.* i. 50. 94 (horum), *P. Sex. Rosc.* 17. 49 (hoc), *Acad.* ii. 27. 86 (hoc), *Tusc. disp.* iv. 28. 60 (haec); *De invent.* ii. 7. 24 (illud); *Ad fam.* ii. 4. 2 (una re), *De off.* ii. 8. 27 (haec una re); *De fin.* iv. 12. 28 (uno modo), Plaut. *Ep.* 362 (uno modo), Cic. *Ad Att.* xii. 6. 2 (uno sc. modo), Pliny *Ep.* iv. 13. 7 (uno remedio). The exact sense of the Suetonian passages in which *sub condicione* appears, is somewhat uncertain (see *Jul.* 68, *Claud.* 24, *Vitell.* 6); a strict grammatical analysis would probably bring the *si*-clauses under this heading. In all the above cases the *si*-clause follows; the reverse order is very rare, e. g., Cic. *De div.* ii. 40. 83 (ea res).

² Cf. chap. 7: at Romae ruere in servitutem consules patres eques.

thought that he understood." In the case first cited the *si*-clause sets forth *the thing feared*; here it tells *under what conditions* something was feared. For the sake of further contrast, the following sentence also may be cited in this connection:

Tac. *Annal.* xvi. 5: constituit plerosque equitum obtritos, et alios morbo exitiabili correptos. quippe *gravior* inerat *metus*, *si spectaculo defuissent*.

Here the analysis of the *si*-clause might be doubtful, were it not for the context, which seems to show that an apodosis is to be supplied. The reference is to Nero's literary performances, and the meaning apparently is that the knights risked death by their constant attendance; but they were possessed by a more urgent dread (of the consequences) if they failed to put in an appearance.

A second illustration of the utility of recognizing the substantive use of the *si*-clause is found in the interpretation of

Livy v. 8. 8-9: nec Veientem satis cohibere nec tueri se ab exteriore poterant hoste. *una spes* erat, *si ex maioribus castris subveniretur*.

In this sentence Livy manifestly means to say that the one hope (*una spes*) of the Romans was the coming of help from the main camp (*si ex maioribus castris subveniretur*); i. e., the *si*-clause expands and explains *una spes*. But Weissenborn, in his note, says an apodosis is to be supplied—"die Bedingung bezieht sich auf das, was gehofft wird, näm. das Lager zu verteidigen." If *spes* were not modified by *una* this suggestion would work very well—"there was hope (that the position might be held), if help came from the main camp." But *una* is here and must be reckoned with. If the reader can include it, and, at the same time, find an apodosis for the *si*-clause in the words supplied, and yet extract a satisfactory sense from the passage, his success will be greater than mine.¹ But Weissenborn doubtless had no idea

¹ It should be noted that the conditions are not met by merely supplying such words as W. suggests, i. e., "There was one hope (that their position might be held) if help came from the main camp." For, with this amplification, "hope" may still have the meaning "chance," and "if" be understood in the sense "namely if;" i. e., this amplification does not preclude interpreting the *si*-clause as substantive, and therefore allows a satisfactory meaning for the sentence. It is when the attempt is made to find an *apodosis* for the *si*-clause in the words supplied that difficulty arises.

of setting us such a problem. The fact that his note is headed *spes erat si* (not *una spes erat si*), and that he cites xxxii. 2, 3 as parallel (there *spes* has no modifier), would seem to indicate that he did not notice *una*. Had he done so, probably he would not have written so perverse a note. I add two similar cases in which the *si*-clause is used substantively:

Caes. *B. G.* iii. 5: ad Galbam adcurrunt atque *unam esse spem* salutis docent, *si* eruptione facta extremum auxilium *experirentur*.

Livy i. 31. 7: vulgo iam homines eum statum rerum, qui sub Numa rege fuerat requirentes, *unam opem* aegris corporibus reliectam, *si* pax veniaque ab diis *impetrata esset*, credebant.

The substantive *si*-clause is of course much rarer than the corresponding *ut*- or *quod*-clause, but the value of its recognition in the matter of interpretation entitles it to far more consideration than it has yet received.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA